

### **Remarks**

Claims 1-10, 12-13, 15-17 and 20 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 5,956,493 (“Hewitt”).

Claims 11 and 18 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hewitt in view of U.S. patent no. 5,546,548 (“Chen”).

Claims 14 and 19 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hewitt in view of U.S. patent no. 6,088,751 (“Jarmillo”).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections because the cited references do not disclose or suggest every element of any pending claim, as the following analysis shows.

Claim 1 recites alternating the grant of bus access between the requesting master clients and the requesting target clients. This limitation was previously in claim 2, which has now been cancelled as redundant. The office action states that a round-robin arbitration, which is referred to by Hewitt only by name, implies this limitation. This statement is incorrect. Round-robin arbitration grants priority to individual devices in a fixed circular fashion. Claim 1 refers to alternating the grant between two different classes of devices. The individual devices that receive the grant will not be fixed, but will vary depending on which individual devices within each class are requesting the bus. Hewitt does not disclose or suggest this limitation.

Claim 10 recites granting the bus based on a combination of a time delay and at least one of a bus lock condition, a sleep entry condition, and a lock-out condition.

Support for this limitation may be found in paragraphs 21-24 of applicant's disclosure. Hewitt does not disclose or suggest such a limitation.

Claim 16 recites arbitrating requests from target clients separately from requests from master clients. This limitation was previously in claim 19, which has been cancelled as redundant. The office action states this limitation can be found in Jarmillo at col. 1 line 66 – col. 2 line 11. However, the cited portion of Jarmillo merely states that both types of devices may request the bus. It does not disclose or suggest that the requests from target devices will be arbitrated separately from the requests from master devices.

Each of the remaining pending claims depends from one of claims 1, 10, and 16 respectively, and therefore contains the same limitations not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

In addition to the above, claim 13 recites that priority is based on, among other things, an order of physical connection. Hewitt does not disclose or suggest this limitation in the cited portion of col 2, lines 19-47, or in any other place.

In addition to the above, claim 17 recites considering a time interval since requesting the bus only if the pending requests have the same highest hierarchical priority. Hewitt does not disclose or suggest combining an age-based priority with a hierarchical-based priority. In particular, the cited portion of Hewitt only discusses an age-based priority.

### **Conclusion**

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and indication of allowance by the Examiner is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning this application, he or she is requested to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number shown below as soon as possible. If any fee insufficiency or overpayment is found, please charge any insufficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Date: July 29, 2005

s/John F. Travis/  
John F. Travis  
Reg. No. 43,203

Attorney Telephone:

(512) 732-3918

Correspondence Address:

Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman, LLP  
12400 Wilshire Blvd  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026